
Wilhelm Müseler. "The Dating and the Sequence of the Persid Frataraka Revisited"

Leonardo Gregoratti

**Electronic version**

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/abstractairanica/49751>

DOI: 10.4000/abstractairanica.49751

ISBN: 1961-960X

ISSN: 1961-960X

Publisher:

CNRS (UMR 7528 Mondes iraniens et indiens), Éditions de l'IFRI

Electronic reference

Leonardo Gregoratti, "Wilhelm Müseler. "The Dating and the Sequence of the Persid Frataraka Revisited"", *Abstracta Iranica* [Online], Volume 40-41 | 2019, document 43, Online since 30 October 2019, connection on 20 April 2021. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/abstractairanica/49751> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/abstractairanica.49751>

This text was automatically generated on 20 April 2021.

Tous droits réservés

Wilhelm Müsseler. "The Dating and the Sequence of the Persid Frataraka Revisited"

Leonardo Gregoratti

REFERENCES

Wilhelm Müsseler. "The Dating and the Sequence of the Persid Frataraka Revisited", *KOINON The International Journal of Classical Numismatic Studies*, I, 2018, p. 84-106

- 1 The author takes into consideration the coinage of Persis, an autonomous region in southern Iran during the Seleucid rule, later a vassal kingdom under the Arsacids. In particular, the first group of issues, those minted by the so-called *frataraka*, local dignitaries who had not yet adopted the title of kings, is analysed. The author defends the early chronology that places the first *frataraka*, Ardaxsher in the first decades of the 3rd century BCE. The main reasons for this choice, that puts into discussion the later chronology proposed by Alram and Wiesehöfer, are the fact that Ardaxsher's coins are found along Seleucus I's ones and that in some cases *frataraka* coins are struck using early Seleucid ones. According to his list of rulers, Ardaxsher was followed by Baydād, Vahbarz and Vādfradād during a span of time of more or less 20 years. As a working hypothesis, the author explains Baydād's two rather different emissions proposing two ruling periods for that ruler, both ended by the revolt of Ardaxsher first and Vahbarz later. All the monetary issues of these rulers are analysed and the types are discussed in connection with chronology and possible references to historical events known from other sources. Author's reconstruction of the first century of Persis' autonomous rule is convincing and his work is extremely valid and detailed. The same cannot be said of the sterile polemic he decides to put as an introduction to his work. He starts labelling epigraphists and numismatists as a sub-category of archaeologists, something that is contradicted completely by the present writer's personal experience, according to which these specialists have more in common with historians than with

archaeologists. Moreover, he maintains that these scholars use to handle ancient direct sources in opposition to historians, who merely interpret the textual evidence provided by the literary tradition. These kind of generalized critics towards a category of scholars are in my opinion disrespectful towards those historians, who work regularly with inscriptions, coins and archaeological reports, taking into great account the opinions of the specialists in those fields. Besides, this stereotyped view of the historians' work as limited to literary sources is non-sense and should not find space in such a high-quality academic paper.

AUTHORS

LEONARDO GREGORATTI

Durham University